



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/061,170	02/01/2002	Andrew D. Padawer	50037.92US01	9151

23552 7590 06/17/2005

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/061,170

Applicant(s)

PADAWER ET AL.

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-24 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 13, 20 recite "the minimum number of characters" (line 8), "the contact" (line 9), "the probability" (line 13). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
2. Claim 23 recites "the data fields" (line 4). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 8, 13, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "weight" is not clearly defined. It is unclear what the claimed "weight" refers to. Does it refer to a candidate contact's body weight? Also, the terms "the match" (line 15, 16 of claim 1) are not clearly defined. It is unclear the claimed refer to "a match" (line 9) or "a call ID match" (line 10).

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “the matched contact” is not clearly defined. The claimed “the matched contact” refers to “a matched contact” (line 11 of claim 1; in *singular* format). Therefore, claim 9 cannot claim “includes.....more contacts” (line 2 of claim 9).

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1, 13, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The phrase “passing.....the weight to a user display” is not disclosed by the

Art Unit: 2645

specification. The specification, on line 10-12 page 7 and line 5-11 page 9, discloses display of call related contact information. The claimed "weight" is NOT a contact related information. Also, one skilled in the art of providing contact information which are stored in a contact information database cannot enable passing such non-database retained information (see also second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections stated above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 9-14, 20, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al (US: 6512819), and in view of Blokker et al (US: 4811407).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 22, Sato et al teach on column 1 line 51, retrieving the caller ID by extracting identification information indicating the caller.

Sato et al teach on column 1 line 55, information registered into the telephone directory (reads on claimed "determining a candidate set of contacts").

Sato et al teach on column 1 line 51-56, means for extracting identification and means for making a comparison, both reads on “contacts correspond to the call ID”. The “comparison” must have a criteria in order to determine a match or not.

Sato et al failed to teach “the criteria determines the minimum number of characters”. However, Blokker et al teach on column 12 line 11-18, a method of comparing each bit of characters with the stored characters in order to determine minimum numbers of mismatching characters. The number of mismatch is the claimed “a weight”. The “minimum number of mismatch” reads on the claimed “the information comprises.....a character length of the match”.

Sato et al teach on column 1 line 54-55, comparison (claimed “match”) between extracted identification and telephone directory and obtain an image (claimed “call related contact information”) for displaying and indicating who is calling.

Sato et al teach on item 102 Fig. 1, a processor, item 101 Fig. 1, a display, item 105 Fig. 1, wireless communication means (reads on claimed “mobile device”).

Regarding claims 2, Sato et al teach on column 1 line 51-52, identification of a caller (reads on “inbound phone call to the calling party”).

Regarding claim 12, Sato et al teach on column 1 line 63-65, Fig. 1, means for transmitting (claimed “hot link”) image from directory database to the display.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al, in view of Blokker et al, and further in view of Ito (JP: 02000253373).

Sato et al in view of Blokker et al as stated in claim 1 above failed to teach “the phone call includes an outbound phone call from the calling party”. However, Ito teaches on SOLUTION – when making an outbound call, the destination number and the face picture of the called party is displayed.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Sato et al in view of Blokker et al to have the “the phone call includes an outbound phone call from the calling party” as taught by Ito such that the modified system of Sato et al in view of Blokker et al would be able to support the system users a confirmation of the party that is called.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al, in view of Blokker et al, and further in view of McAllister et al (US: 6421672).

Sato et al in view of Blokker et al as stated in claim 1 above failed to teach “pre-processing the call ID to remove extraneous characters from the call ID”. However, McAllister et al teach on column 4 line 4, removing extraneous character from “COOKE” to identify “COOK”.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Sato et al in view of Blokker et al to have the “pre-processing the call ID to remove extraneous characters from the call ID” as taught by McAllister et al such that the modified system of Sato et al in view of Blokker et al would be able to support the system users to accurately identify a contact by eliminating extraneous characters.

9. Claims 5-8, 15-18, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al, in view of Blokker et al, and further in view of Davis et al (US: 5485373).

Regarding claims 5, 15, 18, 23, Sato et al in view of Blokker et al as stated in claim 1 above failed to teach “performing a Boyer Moore fast approximation”. However, Davis et al teach on column 2 to column 22, text searching in a database (reads on claimed “data fields”) by using Boyer Moore process. The “text searching” is the claimed “match between character strings”.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Sato et al in view of Blokker et al to have the “performing a Boyer Moore fast approximation” as taught by Davis et al such that the modified system of Sato et al in view of Blokker et al would be able to support the system users to accurately identify a contact by performing the well known Boyer Moore process.

Regarding claims 6, 16, 17, 24, Sato et al failed to teach “performing a tail end match”. However, Davis et al teach on column 16 line 52-61, the Boyer Moore process performs comparison in reverse order (claimed “tail end match”).

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Sato et al in view of Blokker et al to have the “performing a tail end match” as taught by Davis et al such that the modified system of Sato et al in view of Blokker et al would be able to support the system users to accurately identify a contact by performing the tail end comparison using the Boyer Moore process.

Regarding claim 7, the modified system of Sato et al in view of Blokker et al and further in view of Davis et al as stated in claim 6 above failed to teach “the extraneous characters removed before performing the tail end match”. However, Davis et al teach on column 15 line 24-34, unmapped characters are removed.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Sato et al in view of Blokker et al and further in view of Davis et al to have the “the extraneous characters removed before performing the tail end match” as taught by Davis et al such that the modified system of Sato et al in view of Blokker et al and further in view of Davis et al would be able to support the system users to accurately identify a contact by removing the extraneous characters.

Regarding claim 8, the rejection as stated in claims 1, 5, 6, 7 above apply.

By combining Sato et al, Blokker et al, and Davis et al, displaying the identified contact by eliminating process that compares the call IDs based on the criteria (claimed “weight”).

10. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al, in view of Blokker et al, and further in view of Kim (US: 6397078).

Sato et al in view of Blokker et al as stated in claim 20 above failed to teach “a touch-sensitive display”. However, Kim teaches on column 1 line 49-52, a touch sensitive display screen.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Sato et al in view of Blokker et al to have the “a touch-sensitive display” as taught by Kim such

that the modified system of Sato et al in view of Blokker et al would be able to support the system users a better user interface.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Igata (US: 5963942) teaches pattern search apparatus and method.

12. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (571) 272-7535. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (571) 272-7547. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to Central FAX Number 703-872-9306.


Application/Control Number: 10/061,170
Art Unit: 2645

Page 10

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600